

REMARKS

This is in full and timely response to the non-final Office Action dated March 2, 2005 (Paper No./Mail Date 0205). The present Amendment amends claim 7 to correct a minor matter of form and otherwise disputes certain findings of fact made in connection with the rejection of the claims. Accordingly, claims 1 to 18 are presently pending in the application, each of which is believed to be in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration in light of the present Amendment and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Priority Acknowledgement

It is noted that the initial Action acknowledges receipt of the certified copy in support of the claim for priority under 35 USC § 119.

Specification

The specification has been reviewed and a few minor changes made to prepare this application for final printing.

Information Disclosure Statement

It is noted with appreciation that the PTO-1449 form that accompanied the IDS previously filed has been acknowledged.

Claim Objections

The Applicant thanks the examiner for a thorough reading of the claims. In accordance with the examiner's suggestion, claim 7 has been amended to correct a minor informality. Withdrawal of this objection is therefore courteously solicited.

Claim Rejections- Alleged Double Patenting

In the Action, claims 1-18 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-13

of co-pending Application No. 10/827,351 ("the '351 Application"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As stated in M.P.E.P § 804(II)(B)(1), "[a] double patenting rejection of the obviousness-type is 'analogous to the nonobviousness requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 103.'" (quoting *In re Braithwaite*, 379 F.2d 594, 154 USPQ 29 (CCPA 1967)). However, in order to establish a double patenting rejection of the obviousness-type, all claim limitations must be recited within the claims of the cited patent. *Id.* The disclosure of the cited patent, however, may not be used in establishing obviousness-type double patenting. *Id.*

In the present case, the patentable line of demarcation between the claims of the present application and that of the '351 Application has been clearly drawn. For example, independent claim 1 of the present application recites "a semiconductor memory apparatus ... wherein ... said redundant lines are shared by said unit blocks pertaining to said one-dimensional group", whereas the '351 Application recites "a semiconductor memory apparatus ... wherein ... said redundant lines are shared by said unit blocks pertaining to said two-dimensional group". In addition, independent claim 15 of the present invention recites "A self-repair method ... wherein ... said unit blocks are further laid out to form a block matrix or a plurality of block matrixes, and every plurality of said unit blocks forms a one-dimensional group oriented in a first direction (row or column direction) or a second direction (column or row direction)", whereas each of the claims directed to a self-repair method in the '351 Application recite a "two-dimensional group". Moreover, independent claim 17 of the present application recites a self-repair method comprising four processes, whereas the self-repair method claimed in the '351 Application merely recites two confirmation processes.

Thus, as has been clearly demonstrated above, the claims of the present invention (and in particular each independent claim of the present application) have a number of clearly patentable differences from claims 1-13 of the '351 Application. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is courteously solicited.

Claims 1-18 were also provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-24 of co-pending Application No. 10/774,573 ("the '573 Application"). This rejection is respectfully

traversed.

As with the '351 Application, the patentable line of demarcation between the claims of the present application and that of the '573 Application has been clearly drawn. For example, independent claim 1 of the present application recites "a semiconductor memory apparatus ... wherein ... said redundant lines are shared by said unit blocks pertaining to said one-dimensional group", whereas the '351 Application recites "a semiconductor memory apparatus ... wherein ... said redundant lines are shared by said unit blocks pertaining to said two-dimensional group". In addition, independent claim 15 of the present invention recites "A self-repair method ... wherein ... said unit blocks are further laid out to form a block matrix or a plurality of block matrixes, and every plurality of said unit blocks forms a one-dimensional group oriented in a first direction (row or column direction) or a second direction (column or row direction)", whereas claims 17 and 20 of the '573 Application directed to a repair search method fail to recite this limitation. Moreover, independent claim 17 of the present application recites a self-repair method comprising four processes, whereas claims 17 and 20 of the '573 Application fail to recite each and every one of these four processes.

Thus, as has been clearly demonstrated above, the claims of the present invention (and in particular each independent claim of the present application) have a number of clearly patentable differences from claims 1-24 of the '573 Application. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is courteously solicited.

Terminal Disclaimer

Although the Applicant believes the claims of the present application are clearly patentably distinguishable from those of the '351 Application and the '573 Application, in order to expedite prosecution the Applicant is prepared to proffer a terminal disclaimer prepared in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(c). Should the examiner desire the filing of such a terminal disclaimer, the examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's representative at the telephone number or address provided below.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If the examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-0013, under Order No. SON-2998, from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 13, 2005

By _____
Ronald P. Kananen
Registration No.: 24,104
Attorneys for Applicant

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER, PLLC
Lion Building
1233 20th Street, N.W., Suite 501
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: (202) 955-3750
Customer No. 23353

In the event additional fees are necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 180013 for any such fees; and applicants hereby petition for any needed extension of time.